

1       trying to change that. The statute that has been imple-  
2       mented and clarified by statute I assume will continue to  
3       be the case.

4               THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Kiefer, one other ques-  
5       tion, just to clarify the record. Do I understand you to  
6       be saying that notwithstanding the fact that Section 5(a)  
7       does not have the limiting language to which Delegate  
8       Case called attention, that is, in Article 5 of the pre-  
9       sent Declaration of Rights, that you are saying that Sec-  
10      tion 5(a) is, nevertheless, subject to that same limita-  
11      tion?

12             DELEGATE KIEFER: I am saying, sir, that it is  
13      the same language that is in our present Constitution, and  
14      if our Court of Appeals, and incidentally these are cases  
15      back in the 19th Century, 70 years old or more and if our  
16      Court of Appeals has made that interpretation of them, it  
17      has made that interpretation of them, but we are not doing  
18      anything but restating what our present Constitution  
19      states.

20             THE CHAIRMAN: You are not using the words of  
21      the present Constitution. That is why I want the record